

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 13-19 remain pending in this application. Claim 31 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new claims have been added.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCrone (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,944) and further in view of Henry et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,392) and Rai et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,110). Claims 14, 15, 16 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCrone, Rai et al and Henry et al as applied to claim 13 and further in view of Reichbauer et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,881,074). Claims 17, 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCrone, Rai et al, Henry et al and Reichbauer et al as applied to claim 16 and further in view of Inamine (U.S. Patent No. 6,196,735). Claims 19, 20, 23, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCrone and Rai et al and further in view of Arimilli et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,528). These rejections are traversed as follows.

According to the presently claimed invention, certain status information, such as copy progress rate (claims 13, 21, 25 and 26), data transfer rate (claims 18, 22, 27 and 28), or cache usage rate (claims 19, 20, 23, 24, 29 and 30), is used to determine which of a plurality of command routes are displayed. In other words, the

displaying of particular routes is based upon the status information as opposed to requiring user input to specifically select a route for display. The claims have been amended to specify that the determination of whether a route is displayed is based upon measuring some parameter and displaying a particular route if that parameter satisfies some threshold. The claims have also been amended to more positively recite how routes are selected for display.

The Examiner acknowledges that LeCrone and Henry fail to disclose that some condition is used to determine which of a plurality of status information acquisition command routes is displayed and relies upon Rai et al to cure this deficiency. However, this reliance upon Rai et al is misplaced. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recited that "a first status information acquisition route on which the first status information acquisition command is relayed is displayed on a host computer if said copy progress rate is below a predetermined threshold, the first status information acquisition route being one of a plurality of status information acquisition command routes on which status information acquisition commands are relayed via one or more of said plurality of storage subsystems". The other independent claims contain variations to this limitation but are all focused upon some criteria that needs to be satisfied in order to display a particular route. This further defines the present invention from the cited references.

Rai et al disclose the displaying of routes according to a scheduling factor. However, this scheduling factor does not relate to whether or not a performance

parameter satisfies a predetermined threshold. The satisfying of the predetermined threshold is a prerequisite in order for a particular route to be displayed according to the present claims.

Fig. 17 of Rai et al merely shows the traffic over a selected link. Fig. 17 does not show that a selected link is displayed if some performance parameter satisfies a predetermined threshold. Fig. 18 of Rai et al shows a link load summary view in which a utilization of each of a plurality of links over time is shown. This is so the network operator can gain an overall view of network loading. Fig. 18 does not disclose that the plurality of links are selected for display because some performance parameter satisfies a predetermined threshold. The deficiencies in Rai et al are not overcome by resort to any of the remaining references.

According to the present invention, if a performance parameter satisfies a predetermined threshold, then a particular route is displayed. This way, an operator can quickly determine which routes have a performance parameter that satisfies a predetermined threshold. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

Request for Interview

Applicants request that the Examiner conduct an interview with the undersigned prior to issuing an Office Action in order to execute prosecution of this

Appl. No. 10/788,453
Amendment dated December 10, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 9, 2007

566.43577X00


application. In this regard, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to arrange an appropriate date and time for such interview.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By 
Shrinath Malur
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120